HN

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/661,273	09/13/2000	Bradley Cain	2204/A50	8324

34845 7590 06/06/2005

STEUBING AND MCGUINESS & MANARAS LLP
125 NAGOG PARK
ACTON, MA 01720

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, THU HA T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2155	

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/661,273	CAIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thu Ha T. Nguyen	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 January 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-55* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-55* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims **1-55** are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed January 27, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

3. Applicant argues that each of references alone an in combination fails to teach moving multicast group access control information closer to the subscribers to facilitate rapid authentication and rapid channel changing in an Internet television system which uses multicast group. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., moving multicast group access control information closer to the subscribers to facilitate rapid authentication and rapid channel changing in an Internet television system which uses multicast group) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

4. Applicant argues that Garrity does not state where for access control information, prior to the request, or before it is needed. In response to applicant's argument, examiner submits that in the previous office action (mail dated 01/13/05), examiner admitted that Garrity does not explicitly teach the access device receives the access control information before it is needed, thereby facilitating changing channels. However Rosser teaches this function (see figures 1, 4, col. 4, lines 55-65, col. 6, lines

50-col. 7, lines 58, col. 12, lines 55-col. 13, lines 48, col. 14, lines 26-52 [The set-top device (i.e., access device) received the programs with insertion of all or any of a graphic or video, user profile, enabling keys and viewer usage profile keys (i.e., access control information) before the viewer requested data. When the viewer requests data, the set-top device compares the insertion (which sends from either LVIS 16 or central studio site 34) to local usage profile in order to authorize the viewer receiving data]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of **Garrity** to include the feature of access device receives the access control information before it is needed, thereby facilitating changing channels as taught by **Rosser** because it would provide an efficient system that have capability to control and authorize the access of information based on client's profile.

5. Applicant argues that Rosser does not teach IP multicast television distribution system, and consequently fails to teach distribution of multicast group access control information. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., IP multicast television distribution system) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Moreover, Garrity, primary reference, teaches multicast group access control information (see col. 3, lines 33-65). Rosser teaches broadcast access control information (see abstract). Therefore, in response to

applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

6. Applicant argues that Dobbins teaches authentication, but not by moving multicast group access control information is moved closer to the subscriber. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., moving multicast group access control information is moved closer to the subscriber) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

7. As a result, cited prior arts do teach and disclose a system and method for access control information for an Internet television system, as broadly claimed by the Applicants. Applicants clearly have still failed to identify specific claim limitations that would define a clearly patentable distinction over prior arts.

8. Therefore, the examiner asserts that cited prior art teaches or suggests the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1, 15, 25, 35, 45, and 55. Claims 2-14, 16-24, 26-34, 36-44, and 46-54 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth in this office action [see rejection below]. Accordingly, claims 1-55 are rejected.

Specification

9. As mentioned in the previous office action (dated 1/13/05), applicant is required to provide all of the copending US. Patent Application Serial Numbers as recited in the cross-reference in page 1 of the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-4, 8, 10-17, 21, 23-27, 31, 33-37, 41, 43-47, 51, and 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Garrity et al.,** (hereinafter Garrity) U.S. Patent No. **6,230,205**, in view of **Rosser** U.S. Patent No. **6,446,261.**

12. As to claim 1, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including an access control method for an internet television system where each television channel is carried over a different multicast group, and subscribers join a

particular multicast group in order to receive a particular channel, the access control method comprising:

distributing multicast group access control information from a distribution device to an access device for use by the access device in authenticating a subsequent request by a host device to join a television channel multicast group (abstract, figure 2, col. 3 lines 33-col. 6 lines 49 [the operation center (136) (figures 1-2, 4) receives distributed information from content providers (102, 104, 106) and the OC (136) subsequent receive a request from content consumer for broadcast/multicast distributed information]);

receiving, by the access device, the subsequent request by the host device to join the television channel multicast group (figure 7, col. 8 lines 30-64);

determining, by the access device, whether the host device is authorized to join the television channel multicast group based upon the access control information distributed from the distribution device (abstract, figures 6-7, col. 8 lines 30-col. 11 lines 58 [The server (400) (figure 4) authenticates the content consumer based on the customer account profile that is provided by the database (424) to server (400)]); and

admitting, by the access device, the host device to the television channel multicast group if and only if the host device is determined to be authorized to join the television channel multicast group (abstract, figures 6-8, col. 8 lines 30-col. 11lines 58).

However **Garrity** does not explicitly teach whereby the access device receives the access control information before it is needed for determining whether the host device is authorized to join the multicast group, thereby facilitating changing channels.

Rosser teaches access device receives the access control information before it is needed for determining whether the host device is authorized to join the broadcast group, thereby facilitating changing channels (figures 1, 4, col. 4, lines 55-65, col. 6, lines 50-col. 7, lines 58, col. 12, lines 55-col. 13, lines 48, col. 14, lines 26-52 [The set-top device (i.e., access device) received the programs with insertion of all or any of a graphic or video, user profile, enabling keys and viewer usage profile keys (i.e., access control information) before the viewer requested data. When the viewer requests data, the set-top device compares the insertion (which sends from either LVIS 16 or central studio site 34) to local usage profile in order to authorize the viewer receiving data]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of **Garrity** to include the feature of access device receives the access control information before it is needed for determining whether the host device is authorized to join the broadcast group, thereby facilitating changing channels as taught by **Rosser** because it would provide an efficient system that have capability to control and authorize the access of information based on client's profile.

13. As to claim 2, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein distributing the access control information from the distribution device to the access device comprises: pushing the access control information from the distribution device to the access control device using a predetermined push mechanism (figure 2, col. 3 lines 33-col. 6 lines 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made that **Garrity** implicitly discloses the content provider unicast distributed information to the OC or server (figures 1-2) that equivalent to the step of pushing the access control information to the access device as disclosed in the applicant's specification. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that **Garrity** performs the same function in substantially the same way to reach substantially the same result.

14. As to claim 3, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the predetermined push mechanism comprises a reliable multicast mechanism (figures 1-2, col. 3 lines 33-col. 4 lines 32).

15. As to claim 4, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein pushing the access control information from the distribution device to the access control device using the predetermined push mechanism comprises: joining a predetermined multicast group by the access device; sending the access control information to the predetermined multicast group by the distribution device using the reliable multicast receiving the access control information by the access device from the multicast group using the reliable multicast mechanism (abstract, figure 1-2, 4, 7, col. 3 lines 33-col. 6 lines 49, col. 7 lines 33-col. 8 lines 64).

16. As to claim 8, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the predetermined push mechanism comprises a management mechanism (abstract, col. 2 lines 12-47).

17. As to claim 10, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the management mechanism comprises a Command Line Interface (CLI) (figure 7, col. 10 lines 29-col. 56).

18. As to claim 11, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein pushing the access control information from the distribution device to the access control device using a predetermined push mechanism comprises: sending the access control information from the distribution device to the access device in the form of management information using the management mechanism (abstract, col. 2 lines 12-47).

19. As to claim 12, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein determining whether the host device is authorized to join the television channel multicast group comprises: authenticating the host device based upon the access control information (abstract, figure 1-2, 4, 7col. 3 lines 33-col. 3 lines 33-col. 6 lines 49, col. 7 lines 33-col. 8 lines 64).

20. As to claim 13, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein admitting the host device to the television channel multicast group comprises: joining the television channel multicast group by the access device using a predetermined multicast routing protocol (abstract, figures 6-8, col. 8 lines 30-col. 11lines 58).

21. As to claim 14, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the predetermined multicast routing protocol (abstract, figures 1-2, 4, col. 3 lines 33-col. 5 lines 37, col. 6 lines 4-col. 7 lines 65). **Garrity** does not explicitly teach comprises a Protocol Independent Multicast (PIM) multicast routing protocol. However, PIM is well known in the art and it is deem to be obvious because **Garrity** teaches the multicast function in the invention, hence it is obvious to use the PIM multicast routing protocol. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to have the use of PIM multicast protocol in the system of **Garrity** because it would have an efficient network management system that multicasts or distributes content resource to selected group or user who is authorized to join the multicast group.

22. As to claim 15, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including an apparatus for distributing access control information in an internet television system whereby each television channel is carried over a different multicast

group, and subscribers join a particular multicast group in order to receive a particular channel, the apparatus comprising:

maintenance logic operably coupled to maintain multicast group access control information (abstract, figures 1-2, 4); and

distribution logic operably coupled to distribute the access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism (abstract, figure 2, col. 3 lines 33-col. 6 lines 49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made that **Garrity** implicitly discloses the content provider unicast distributed information to the OC or server (figures 1-2) based on pre-schedule that equivalent to the step of pushing the access control information to the access device based on predetermined push mechanism as disclosed in the applicant's specification. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that **Garrity** performs the same function in substantially the same way to reach substantially the same result.

However **Garrity** does not explicitly teach whereby the access device receives the access control information before it is needed for determining whether a host device is authorized to join a multicast group, thereby facilitating changing channels.

Rosser teaches access device receives the access control information before it is needed for determining whether a host device is authorized to join a broadcast group, thereby facilitating changing channels (figures 1, 4, col. 4, lines 55-65, col. 6, lines 50-col. 7, lines 58, col. 12, lines 55-col. 13, lines 48, col. 14, lines 26-52 [The set-top device (i.e., access device) received the programs with insertion of all or any of a graphic or

video, user profile, enabling keys and viewer usage profile keys (i.e., access control information) before the viewer requested data. When the viewer requests data, the set-top device compares the insertion (which sends from either LVIS 16 or central studio site 34) to local usage profile in order to authorize the viewer receiving data]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of **Garrity** to include the feature of access device receives the access control information before it is needed for determining whether the host device is authorized to join the broadcast group, thereby facilitating changing channels as taught by **Rosser** because it would provide an efficient system that have capability to control and authorize the access of information based on client's profile.

23. As to claim 25, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer program for controlling a computer system for delivering television where each channel is carried over a different multicast group, and subscribers join a particular multicast group in order to receive a particular channel, the computer program comprising:

maintenance logic programmed to maintain multicast group access control information (abstract, figures 1-2, 4); and

distribution logic programmed to distribute the access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism (abstract, figure 2, col. 3 lines 33-col. 6 lines 49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made that **Garrity** implicitly discloses the content provider unicast distributed information to the OC or server (figures 1-2) based on pre-schedule that equivalent to the step of pushing the access control information to the access device based on predetermined push mechanism as disclosed in the applicant's specification. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that **Garrity** performs the same function in substantially the same way to reach substantially the same result.

However **Garrity** does not explicitly teach whereby the access device receives the access control information before it is needed, thereby facilitating changing channels.

Rosser teaches access device receives the access control information before it is needed, thereby facilitating changing channels (figures 1, 4, col. 4, lines 55-65, col. 6, lines 50-col. 7, lines 58, col. 12, lines 55-col. 13, lines 48, col. 14, lines 26-52 [The set-top device (i.e., access device) received the programs with insertion of all or any of a graphic or video, user profile, enabling keys and viewer usage profile keys (i.e., access control information) before the viewer requested data. When the viewer requests data, the set-top device compares the insertion (which sends from either LVIS 16 or central studio site 34) to local usage profile in order to authorize the viewer receiving data]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of **Garrity** to include the feature of access device receives the access control information before it is needed, thereby facilitating changing channels as taught by **Rosser** because it would provide an efficient

system that have capability to control and authorize the access of information based on client's profile.

24. As to claim 35, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including an apparatus for providing receiver access control in an internet television system for delivering television where each channel is carried over a different multicast group, and subscribers join a particular multicast group in order to receive a particular channel, the apparatus comprising:

distribution logic operably coupled to receive multicast group access control information from a distribution device using a predetermined push mechanism (abstract, figure 2, col. 3 lines 33-col. 6 lines 49);

host interface logic operably coupled to receive a request from a host device to join a television channel multicast group (figure 7, col. 8 lines 30-64); and

access control logic operably coupled to determine whether the host device is authorized to join the television channel multicast group based upon the access control information (abstract, figures 6-7, col. 8 lines 30-col. 11 lines 58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made that **Garrity** implicitly discloses the content provider unicast distributed information to the OC or server (abstract, figures 1-2) based on pre-schedule. The OC or server (136) (figures 1-2, 4) authenticates the content consumer based on the profile that is provided by the content provider to server and is stored in database (414) equivalent to the process of pushing the access control information to

the access device based on predetermined push mechanism. The access device receives request by the host device to join the multicast group and determines whether the host device is authorized to join the multicast group based upon the access control information as disclosed in the applicant's specification. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that **Garrity** performs the same function in substantially the same way to reach substantially the same result.

However **Garrity** does not explicitly teach whereby the access device receives the access control information before it is needed, thereby facilitating changing channels.

Rosser teaches access device receives the access control information before it is needed, thereby facilitating changing channels (figures 1, 4, col. 4, lines 55-65, col. 6, lines 50-col. 7, lines 58, col. 12, lines 55-col. 13, lines 48, col. 14, lines 26-52 [The set-top device (i.e., access device) received the programs with insertion of all or any of a graphic or video, user profile, enabling keys and viewer usage profile keys (i.e., access control information) before the viewer requested data. When the viewer requests data, the set-top device compares the insertion (which sends from either LVIS 16 or central studio site 34) to local usage profile in order to authorize the viewer receiving data]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of **Garrity** to include the feature of access device receives the access control information before it is needed, thereby facilitating changing channels as taught by **Rosser** because it would provide an efficient

system that have capability to control and authorize the access of information based on client's profile.

25. As to claim 45, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer program for controlling a computer system where each channel is carried over a different multicast group, and subscribers join a particular multicast group in order to receive a particular channel, the computer program comprising:

distribution logic programmed to receive multicast group access control information from a distribution device using a predetermined push mechanism (abstract, figure 2, col. 3 lines 33-col. 6 lines 49);

host interface logic programmed to receive a request from a host device to join a television channel multicast group (abstract, figures 6-7, col. 8 lines 30-col. 11 lines 58); and

access control logic programmed to determine whether the host device is authorized to join the television channel multicast group based upon the access control information (abstract, figures 6-7, col. 8 lines 30-col. 11 lines 58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made that **Garrity** implicitly discloses the content provider unicast distributed information to the OC or server (abstract, figures 1-2) based on pre-schedule. The OC or server (136) (figures 1-2, 4) authenticates the content consumer based on the profile that is provided by the content provider to server and is stored in database (414) equivalent to the process of pushing the access control information to

the access device based on predetermined push mechanism. The access device receives request by the host device to join the multicast group and determines whether the host device is authorized to join the multicast group based upon the access control information as disclosed in the applicant's specification. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that **Garrity** performs the same function in substantially the same way to reach substantially the same result.

However **Garrity** does not explicitly teach whereby the access device receives the access control information before it is needed, thereby facilitating changing channels.

Rosser teaches access device receives the access control information before it is needed, thereby facilitating changing channels (figures 1, 4, col. 4, lines 55-65, col. 6, lines 50-col. 7, lines 58, col. 12, lines 55-col. 13, lines 48, col. 14, lines 26-52 [The set-top device (i.e., access device) received the programs with insertion of all or any of a graphic or video, user profile, enabling keys and viewer usage profile keys (i.e., access control information) before the viewer requested data. When the viewer requests data, the set-top device compares the insertion (which sends from either LVIS 16 or central studio site 34) to local usage profile in order to authorize the viewer receiving data]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of **Garrity** to include the feature of access device receives the access control information before it is needed, thereby facilitating changing channels as taught by **Rosser** because it would provide an efficient

system that have capability to control and authorize the access of information based on client's profile.

26. As to claim 55, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including an internet television system comprising a distribution device in communication with at least one access device over a communication network, wherein the distribution device uses a predetermined push mechanism to distribute multicast group access control information to the at least one access device, and wherein the at least one access device uses the access control information to control access to at least one television channel multicast group (abstract, figures 2, 6-7, col. 3 lines 33-col. 6 lines 49, col. 8 lines 30-col. 11 lines 58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made that **Garrity** implicitly discloses the content provider unicast distributed information to the OC or server (abstract, figures 1-2) based on pre-schedule. The OC or server (136) (figures 1-2, 4) authenticates the content consumer based on the profile that is provided by the content provider to server and is stored in database (414) equivalent to the process of pushing the access control information to the access device based on predetermined push mechanism. The access device receives request by the host device to join the multicast group and determines whether the host device is authorized to join the multicast group based upon the access control information as disclosed in the applicant's specification. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that

Garrity performs the same function in substantially the same way to reach substantially the same result.

27. As to claim 16-17, 21, 23-24, 26-27, 31, 33-34, 36-37, 41, 43-44, 46-47, 51, and 53-54, they are system and computer program claims directed to distributing access control information in an internet television of method claims 3-4, 8, and 10-11. Claims 16-17, 21, 23-24, 26-27, 31, 33-34, 36-37, 41, 43-44, 46-47, 51, and 53-54 have similar limitations to claims 3-4, 8, and 10-11; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

28. Claims 5-7, 9, 18-20, 22, 28-30, 32, 38-40, 42, 48-50 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Garrity** and **Rosser**, in view of **Dobbins et al.,** (hereinafter Dobbins) U.S. Publication No. **US 2002/0066033**.

29. As to claim 5, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the predetermined push mechanism (abstract, figure 1-2, 4, 7, col. 3 lines 33-col. 6 lines 49, col. 7 lines 33-col. 8 lines 64); however, **Garrity and Rosser** do not explicitly teach a policy service. **Dobbins** teaches a policy service (abstract, paragraphs 0009-0010, 0021). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made that **Garrity** suggests the process of predetermined push mechanism to modify the process of predetermined push mechanism comprises a policy service by **Dobbins.** One of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to modify **Garrity and Rosser** in view of **Dobbins** because it would have an efficient communications system that can manage and distribute content resources to users based on user's profile or, in other words, based on access control information by using policy service rule.

30. As to claim 6, **Garrity and Rosser** do not explicitly teach the invention as claimed; however, **Dobbins** teaches wherein the policy service comprises a Common Open Policy Service (COPS) (abstract, paragraph 0021). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Garrity, Rosser and Dobbins** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 5, supra.

31. As to claim 7, **Garrity** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein pushing the access control information from the distribution device to the access control device using a predetermined push mechanism comprises: sending the access control information from the distribution device to the access device (abstract, figure 2, col. 3 lines 33-col. 6 lines 49). However, **Garrity and Rosser** do not explicitly teach the access control information is sent in the form of policy information using the policy service. **Dobbins** teaches the access control information is sent in the form of policy information using the policy service (abstract, paragraphs 0009-0019, 0021). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time

of the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Garrity, Rosser and Dobbins** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 5, supra.

32. As to claim 9, **Garrity and Rosser** do not explicitly teach the invention as claimed; however, **Dobbins** teaches wherein the management mechanism comprises a Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) (figures 1, 11, paragraphs 0009-0010, 0020-0021, 0173). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Garrity, Rosser and Dobbins** to have a SNMP in the management mechanism because it would have an efficient network management to managing complex network and content resources.

33. As to claim 18-20, 22, 28-30, 32, 38-40, 42, 48-50, and 52, they are system and computer program claims directed to distributing access control information in an internet television of method claims 5-7, and 9. Claims 18-20, 22, 28-30, 32, 38-40, 42, 48-50, and 52 have similar limitations to claims 5-7, and 9; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

34. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

35. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Ha Nguyen, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3989. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne, can be reached at (571) 272-4001.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bharat Barot

BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Thu Ha Nguyen

May 21, 2005